

Risk Areas	
Threat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty in threat accuracy. • Sensitivity of design and technology to threat. • Vulnerability of system to threat and threat countermeasures. • Vulnerability of program to intelligence penetration.
Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational requirements not properly established or vaguely stated. • Requirements are not stable. • Required operating environment not described. • Requirements do not address logistics and suitability. • Requirements are too constrictive—identify specific solutions that force high cost.
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design implications not sufficiently considered in concept exploration. • System will not satisfy user requirements. • Mismatch of user manpower or skill profiles with system design solution or Human-machine interface problems. • Increased skills or more training requirements identified late in the acquisition process. • Design not cost effective. • Design relies on immature technologies or “exotic” materials to achieve performance objectives. • Software design, coding, and testing*
Test and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test planning not initiated early in program (CTD Phase). • Testing does not address the ultimate operating environment. • Test procedures do not address all major performance and suitability specifications. • Test facilities not available to accomplish specific tests, especially system-level tests. • Insufficient time to test thoroughly.
Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same risks as contained in the Significant Risks for Test and Evaluation. • M&S are not verified, validated, or accredited for the intended purpose. • Program lacks proper tools and modeling and simulation capability to assess alternatives.
Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program depends on unproved technology for success—there are no alternatives. • Program success depends on achieving advances in state-of-the-art technology. • Potential advances in technology will result in less than optimal cost-effective system or make system components obsolete. • Technology has not been demonstrated in required operating environment. • Technology relies on complex hardware, software, or integration design.
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate supportability late in development or after fielding, resulting in need for engineering changes, increased costs, and/or schedule delays. • Life-cycle costs not accurate because of poor logistics supportability analyses. • Logistics analyses results not included in cost-performance tradeoffs. • Design trade studies do not include supportability considerations.
Production / Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production implications not considered during concept exploration. • Production not sufficiently considered during design. • Inadequate planning for long lead items and vendor support. • Production processes not proven. • Prime contractors do not have adequate plans for managing subcontractors. • Sufficient facilities not readily available for cost-effective production. • Contract offers no incentive to modernize facilities or reduce cost.
Concurrency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immature or unproved technologies will not be adequately developed before production. • Production funding will be available too early—before development effort has sufficiently matured. • Concurrency established without clear understanding of risks.
Capability of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer has limited experience in specific type of development.

Risk Areas	
Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor has poor track record relative to costs and schedule. • Contractor experiences loss of key personnel. • Prime contractor relies excessively on subcontractors for major development efforts. • Contractor will require significant capitalization to meet program requirements.
Cost/Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic cost objectives not established early. • Marginal performance capabilities incorporated at excessive costs; satisfactory cost-performance tradeoffs not done. • Excessive life-cycle costs due to inadequate treatment of support requirements. • Significant reliance on software. • Funding profile does not match acquisition strategy. • Funding profile not stable from budget cycle to budget cycle.
Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule not considered in trade-off studies. • Schedule does not reflect realistic acquisition planning. • APB schedule objectives not realistic and attainable. • Resources not available to meet schedule.
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition strategy does not give adequate consideration to various essential elements, e.g., mission need, test and evaluation, technology, etc. • Subordinate strategies and plans are not developed in a timely manner or based on the acquisition strategy. • Proper mix (experience, skills, stability) of people not assigned to PMO or to contractor team. • Organization (structure, IPT, etc) not clearly defined or understood • Effective risk assessments not performed or results not understood and acted upon.
Platform Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology has not previously been integrated on target platform • Integration of technology on current platform has not been considered • Impact of technology integration future platforms upgrades has not been considered
System of Systems Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology has not been integrated and evaluated in a system of systems environment • Impact weapon system technology on other battlefield systems has not been considered
Interoperability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interoperability has not been adequately evaluated • Interoperability with US system ahs not been demonstrated • Interoperability with Allie systems has not been evaluated or demonstrated